Testing the correlation of ultra-high energy cosmic rays with high redshift sources

Günter Sigl[a*], Diego F. Torres[b†], Luis A. Anchordoqui[c], and Gustavo E. Romero[b]
[a] Institut d'Astrophysique de Paris, UPR 341 CNRS, 98bis Boulevard Arago, 75014 Paris, France
[b]Instituto Argentino de Radioastronomía, C.C.5, 1894 Villa Elisa, Buenos Aires, Argentina
[c]Department of Physics, Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts 02115, USA

We study the correlation between compact radio quasars or 3EG gamma-ray blazars and the arrival directions of cosmic rays above 10^{19} eV using an updated list of air shower detections. Our Monte Carlo simulations reveal no significant correlations above random and some previous positive results appear to be an effect of the small sample size. Consequently, unless somehow severely deflected, there is no evidence for ultra-high energy cosmic ray primaries being new particles or particles with new interactions beyond the electroweak scale, produced in high-redshift active galactic nuclei.

arXiv:astro-ph/0008363v2 4 Dec 2000

Over the last few years, several giant air showers have been detected confirming the arrival of cosmic rays (CRs) with energies greater than a few hundred EeV (1 EeV $\equiv 10^{18}$ eV) [1]. The nature and origin of these extraordinarily energetic particles remain a mystery [2]. The main problem posed by the detection of CRs of such energy, assuming them to be photons, nucleons, or nuclei, is that interactions with the microwave background radiation limit their attenuation length to less than about 50 Mpc. Therefore, if the CR sources were all at cosmological distances, the energy spectrum would exhibit the so-called Geisen-Zatsepin-Kuzmin (GZK) [3] cut-off around 80 EeV. Since this is not observed, an astrophysical origin requires the sources to be within about 100 Mpc. Furthermore, apart from the energetic difficulties of accelerating particles to such energies [4], the seeming isotropy on large angular scales of the observed arrival directions up to the highest energies [5] leaves only two possibilities for the source locations: 1) There must be many nearby sources, at least one close to each arrival direction, but no such convincing source candidates within 100 Mpc have been found [6]. 2) There are only very few nearby sources which then requires strong deflection [7] in Galactic and/or extragalactic magnetic fields of micro Gauss strength close to existing upper limits [8].

Recently, Farrar and Biermann [9] have pointed out the existence of a strong correlation between compact radio quasars (CRQSOs) and CR events with energies above 80 EeV at 1σ level, i.e. events with nominal energies high enough that the full 1σ error bar is above 80 EeV. Specifically, they have argued that the arrival directions of the CRs of such energies point back to CRQSOs (redshifts in the range $z = 0.3 - 2.2$) with a probability of chance association of 5×10^{-3}. If such a correlation is real, it could only be due to particles generated in these high-redshift sources, which should traverse unscathed through the primeval radiation evading the GZK cut-off and being deflected by less than the experimental angular resolution, of the order of a degree. Note that in such scenarios the ratio of the signal of neutral particle flux to the charged particle background depends on many parameters such as the acceleration process and charged particle deflection by large scale magnetic fields but should become large above the GZK cut-off. In the previous analysis the CRQSO-correlation appeared not to depend strongly on the energy threshold [10].

Since the energies of the known strongly or electromagnetically interacting particles drop below $\simeq 80$ EeV during the propagation from high redshift distances regardless of the initial energy [2], and since within the Standard Model neutrinos cannot give rise to the observed showers due to their small interaction cross section, a clearly established correlation would most likely indicate new physics. Possibilities involving neutral, undeflected particles that have been discussed in the literature include undiscovered neutral hadrons with masses above a few GeV [11], and neutrinos attaining cross sections in the millibarn range above the electroweak scale, which would make them primary candidates for air showers observed at the highest energies. Sufficiently heavy neutral particles would avoid pion production and thus the GZK cut-off, whose threshold energy increases linearly with rest mass m, $E_{th} = m_\pi(m + m_\pi/2)/\varepsilon$, where m_π is the pion mass and ε is the background photon energy. Such particles have been discussed in the context of supersymmetry with a light gluino, although this possibility appears to be close to being ruled out [12]. If new physics becomes relevant around TeV energies, increased neutrino-nucleon cross sections can occur due to the exchange of graviton Kaluza-Klein modes in the context of extra dimensions [13] or due to an exponential increase of the number

*E-mail address: sigl@iap.fr
†E-mail address: dtorres@venus.fisica.unlp.edu.ar

of degrees of freedom in the context of string theory [14].

In the absence of new physics only neutrinos producing nucleons and photons via resonant Z-production with the relic neutrino background within about 50 Mpc from the Earth could give rise to angular correlations with high redshift sources [15]. However, this requires enormous neutrino fluxes and/or extreme clustering of relic neutrinos with masses in the eV range for the interaction rates to be sufficiently high [16].

Very recently, the Haverah Park experiment presented the analysis of inclined showers ($60^\circ <$ zenith angle $< 80^\circ$) which includes two events above 100 EeV [17]. In addition, the Akeno Giant Air Shower Array (AGASA) has reported several remarkable CR events, scattered across half the sky, [5,18], that doubled the original sample used in Ref. [9]. Thus, and in the light of the theoretical scenarios mentioned above, it is worthwhile to test again the possible correlation between the arrival direction of the most energetic CRs and CRQSOs with flat spectrum. These quasars are strong radio emitters, a fact that along with their compactness and variability, is indicative of strong beaming. The bulk of the observed non-thermal emission of these objects is thought to be produced in strong, relativistic jets of charged particles emitted by the active nucleus, which is likely formed by an accreting supermassive black hole.

An interesting sub-group of these sources is formed by the gamma-ray emitting blazars, which are presumably the most energetic of them all. There are 66 blazars detected with high confidence by the EGRET telescope of the Compton Gamma Ray Observatory, 47 of them in the declination range we are interested in [19]. The 3EG catalog currently contains the most complete sample of high energy blazars detected so far. Although the most popular models for gamma-ray emission in these objects are of leptonic nature, there exists a very interesting family of hadronic models where the high-energy emission is the result of a proton-initiated cascade [20]. These models open up the possibility that primaries for ultra-high energy cosmic rays (UHECRs) above 10^{19} eV could come from secondary reactions in the hadronic showers, making very energetic EGRET AGN detections potential candidates for the sources of UHECR events. We shall use then these 47 EGRET sources as well as the 451 CQSOs with flat spectrum and declination above -10^o degrees taken from the surveys of Ref. [21], to test again the hypothesis advanced by Farrar and Biermann. We shall use the new and enlarged AGASA UHECR sample [18] plus the highest energy events detected by Haverah Park [17,22] and Fly's Eye [23], see Table 1.

In order to establish the level of positional coincidence between QSOs and UHECR events and evaluate its significance, we shall adopt the code recently developed by Romero et al. [24] for gamma-ray bursts and unidentified galactic gamma-ray source studies. This code calculates angular distances between different kinds of celestial objects in selected catalogs, and establishes the level of positional correlation between them. Numerical simulations using large numbers of synthetic populations (thousands of them were made for each correlation study) drawn from an isotropic distribution, i.e. sampled uniformly in right ascension and declination, are then performed in order to determine the probability of pure chance spatial association. In the present case, we generate synthetic populations of the same number of ultra-high energy cosmic ray events as observed and compare them with the actual positions of CRQSO and gamma-ray blazars. We have taken into account firstly that the uncertainties in the arrival directions of each of the UHECRs is maintained, i.e. we consider the same positional errors as those reported for the observed events, and secondly, that the artificial sets of UHECR events are constrained (as the actual ones) to the declination range $\delta > -10^o$. The treatment of the positional errors is as follows: we consider a circle around the centroid of each UHECR event; this circle has a radius equal to the reported 1 sigma position error for the UHECR. If a CRQSOs or EGRET blazar is within this circle, we say that there is a positional coincidence. This procedure was adopted for all events. In the case of the Fly's Eye and other experiments, where there is an elongated error box, it was substituted by a circle of similar area. We are not giving a higher significance to directional coincidences with small offsets than to coincidences that are not so close, just because the original errors of the UHECRs are of the order of degrees. The reader is referred to Ref. [24] for more details about the procedure.

The results of our analysis are shown in Tables 2 (CRQSOs) and 3 (gamma-ray blazars), where we present, from left to right, the adopted energy cut-off, the number of real events detected by AGASA (Ag), Haverah Park (HP), and Fly's Eye (FE), the number of real positional matches found, the number expected from pure chance estimated by the simulations, and finally the probability that the results be the mere effect of chance. In establishing the positional correlations, both real and simulated, we have adopted an average error of 1.6^o for the AGASA events, as recommended in Ref. [18]. As a consequence, the highest energy event of AGASA (Ag213) is not coincident with any CRQSO, contrary to what was mentioned in Ref. [9]. For the remaining errors we have kept those used by Farrar and Biermann. AGASA reports an angular cone radius defined such that in 68% of the events, the true direction is

contained within the error cone, it results to be 1.6^o including systematic errors. Errors in energy for AGASA events were taken as 30%.

From our results using the newest UHECR sample, it can be seen that the probabilities for the actual coincidence level to be a random occurrence significantly rise with respect to the previous work by Farrar and Biermann. The actual coincidences are all less than 2σ away from the simulated mean value.[1] In order to test the consistency between our results and those of Farrar and Biermann for the case of CRQSOs, we repeated the analysis for the most restrictive cut-off in Table 1 (70 EeV - 2σ) without taking into account the recent data reported by Haverah Park, and considering the positional error for Ag213 big enough for the CRQSO possible counterpart to be included (i.e. an error of 1.8^o as in [25]). This situation reproduces the case reported by Farrar and Biermann (i.e. the event sample excluding AG110) [10] and yields a simulated positional coincidence of 1.75 ± 0.90, with a chance association probability of 6 %, as compared to their number of 1.6% [10]. This difference is the result of the use of a different statistical technique, particularly in the treatment of positional errors which in our case were taken into account using top hat functions. We remark, however, that the samples of both, UHECR events and CRQSOs were the same. Although for the old data set our analysis method yields chance probabilities larger by a factor $3-4$ than theirs, this does not change our main conclusion, namely that for the new data set the chance probabilities increase by a factor > 5 (within our analysis) and therefore become insignificant.

The correlation with gamma-ray blazars is also likely the result of chance: we obtain chance probabilities of 26 % for the highest energy events and of 46 % for the events with an energy cut-off at 27 EeV. For CRQSOs the probabilities are somewhat lower, but still not significant and significantly above the values given in Ref. [9].

Virmani et al. [26] recently have also performed a correlation study. Their analysis shows a remarkable correlation between UHECRs and CRQSOs, apparently in contradiction with our result. However, most of their correlation signal comes from events with large uncertainty both in energy and in position. It can be seen that independently of the statistical test the correlation between UHECRs and CRQSOs decreases when considering only the highest energy events ($E > 8 \times 10^{19}$ eV at 1-standard deviation) that are relevant for new physics because they have no contamination from the expected proton pile-up around the photopion production threshold. Furthermore, the QSO sample used by Virmani et al. is a subsample of ours, formed only by 285 radio loud quasars with flat spectrum obtained from Kuhr's catalog and checked with NED. Apparently BL LACs or blazars were not considered, nor undetermined cases. The possibility of the latter being usual radio galaxies is small because of the flat spectral index, and consequently both Farrar and Biermann's and our present study took them into account. Virmani et al. also included UHECR events from the SUGAR experiment, which is the only UHECR detector that was operative in the southern hemisphere. These events strongly contribute to their correlation signal as can be seen from their Table 1. However, due to the large detector spacing in SUGAR, their energy and angular resolution were much poorer than for other experiments and it is not clear whether the events seen were above the GZK cut-off [27]. Finally, the UHECR sample in the northern hemisphere used by Virmani et al. is different from ours: we considered 10 UHECR events at most, 8 of them were studied by Virmani et al., but two recent events from Haverah Park were not. The positional error in AGASA was 1.6 degrees in our case [18] and 1.8 in theirs. Taking into account these differences, the statistical methods used by Virmani et al. would also give a much weaker correlation signal.

In the light of these results, our conclusion is that the association of CRQSOs and gamma-ray emitting blazars with UHECRs above the GZK cut-off appears to be not compelling. Hence, there is currently no support for new multi-GeV neutral hadronic particles, or for neutrino-nucleon cross sections in the millibarn range, as explanations of the highest energy cosmic rays, at least not if these particles are conjectured to be produced in the classes of sources considered here. We further note that such scenarios, if there were evidence for them, would require the sources to accelerate protons at least up to $\sim 10^{22}$ eV, since the neutral primary candidates have to be produced as secondaries. While standard acceleration theory requires rather extreme parameters to achieve that, we note that only a few dozen such sources in the whole visible Universe would suffice.

---

[1]Note also that the UHECR event recorded on 97/03/30, ($E \approx 150$ EeV) which satisfies a restrictive cut-off energy being at least ≥ 50 EeV at 2σ level, has no CQSO within its error box. Even doubling the error and searching for background sources with NED, no CQSO appears there.

Acknowledgments

This work has been supported by the agencies CONICET and ANPCT (through grant PICT 98 No. 03-04881), and by Fundación Antorchas through separate grants to D.F.T. and G.E.R..

---

[1] S. Yoshida, and H. Dai, J. Phys. G **24**, 905 (1998).
[2] P. Bhattacharjee, and G. Sigl, Phys. Rep. **327**, 109 (2000), and references therein.
[3] K. Greisen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **16**, 748 (1966); G. T. Zatsepin, and V. A. Kuz'min, Pis'ma Zh. Éksp. Teor. Fiz. **4**, 114 (1966) [JETP Lett. **4**, 78 (1966)].
[4] A. M. Hillas, Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys. **22**, 425 (1984); C. A. Norman, D. B. Melrose, and A. Achterberg, Astrophys. J. **454**, 60 (1995).
[5] N. Hayashida et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1000 (1996); M. Takeda et al., Astrophys. J. **522**, 225 (1999) [astro-ph/9902239].
[6] In particular, a comprehensive analysis of the highest energy events was reported in, J. W. Elbert and P. Sommers, Astrophys. J. **441**, 151 (1995).
[7] J. Wdowczyk, and A. W. Wolfendale, Nature **281**, 356 (1979); G. Sigl, M. Lemoine, and P. Biermann, Astropart. Phys. **10**, 141 (1999); M. Lemoine, G. Sigl, and P. Biermann, [astro-ph/9903124].
[8] G. R. Farrar and T. Piran, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 3527 (2000); P. Blasi, S. Burles, and A. V. Olinto, Astrophys. J. **514**, L79 (1999).
[9] G. R. Farrar and P. L. Biermann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 3579 (1998).
[10] C. M. Hoffman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2471 (1999); G. R. Farrar and P. L. Biermann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2472 (1999).
[11] G. R. Farrar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 4111 (1996); D. J. H. Chung, G. R. Farrar, and E. W. Kolb, Phys. Rev. **D57**, 4696 (1998).
[12] I. F. Albuquerque et al. (E761 collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 3252 (1997); A. Alavi-Harati et al. (KTeV collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2128 (1999); L. Clavelli, [hep-ph/9908342].
[13] S. Nussinov and R. Shrock, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 105002 (1999); P. Jain, D. W. McKay, S. Panda, and J. P. Ralston, Phys. Lett. B**484**, 267 (2000); C. Taylor, A. Olinto and G. Sigl, [hep-ph/0002257].
[14] G. Domokos and S. Kovesi-Domokos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1366 (1999) .
[15] T. J. Weiler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 234 (1982); Astrophys. J. **285**, 495 (1984);
[16] S.Yoshida, G. Sigl, and S. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5505 (1998); J. J. Blanco-Pillado, R. A. Vázquez, and E. Zas, Phys. Rev. D**61**, 123003 (2000).
[17] M. Ave, J. A. Hinton, R. A. Vázquez, A. A. Watson and E. Zas, [astro-ph/0007386]. The uncertainty in the azimuth angle was taken from: M. Ave, J. A. Hinton, R. A. Vázquez, A. A. Watson and E. Zas, Astropart. Phys. **14**, 109 (2000) [astro-ph/0003011].
[18] M. Takeda et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1163 (1998); N. Hayashida et al., [astro-ph/0008102].
[19] R.C. Hartman et al., Astrophys. J. Suppl. **123**, 79 (1999).
[20] K. Mannheim, Astron. Astrophys. **269**, 67 (1993); K. Mannheim and P. L. Biermann, Astron. Astrophys. **221**, 211 (1989); C. von Montigny et al., Astrophys. J. **440**, 525, (1995); M. Sikora, M. C. Begelman, and B. Rudak, Astrophys. J. **341**, L33, (1989); J. G. Kirk and A. Mastichiadis, Astron. Astrophys. **213**, 75 (1989).
[21] I. I. K. Pauliny-Toth et al., Astron. J. **77**, 265 (1972); 797 (1972); **83**, 451 (1978); H. Kühr et al., Astron. J. **86** 854 (1981); Astron. Astrophys. Suppl. Ser. **45**, 367 (1981).
[22] M. A. Lawrence, R. J. O. Reid, and A. A. Watson, J. Phys. G. **17**, 733 (1991).
[23] D. J. Bird et al., Astrophys. J. **441**, 144 (1995).
[24] G. E. Romero, D. F. Torres, I. Andruchow, L. Anchordoqui and B. Link, Mont. Not. Royal Astron. Soc. **308**, 799 (1999); G.E. Romero, P. Benaglia and D.F. Torres, Astron. Astrophys. **348**, 868 (1999).
[25] Y. Uchihori, M. Nagano, M. Takeda, M. Teshima, J. Lloyd-Evans and A. A. Watson, Astropart. Phys. **13**, 151 (2000) [astro-ph/9908193].
[26] A. Virmani, S. Bhattacharya, P. Jain, S. Razzaque, J. P. Ralston, and D. W. McKay, [astro-ph/0010235]
[27] see, e.g., the discussion in M. Nagano and A. A. Watson, Rev. Mod. Phys. **72**, 689 (2000).

TABLE I. Cosmic ray events considered in the study. Errors in position are given, except for the AGASA experiment, which was considered as a circle of 1.6 degrees radius, see text. Errors in energy for AGASA events were taken as 30%, see text.

UHECRs	energy [$\times 10^{20}$eV]	RA (deg)	DEC (deg)
FE320	3.20 +0.92 -0.94	85.2 ± 0.5	48.0 +5.2 -6.3
HP120	1.20 ± 0.10	179.0 ± 2.7	27 ± 2.8
HP105	1.05 ± 0.08	201.0 ± 8.7	71 ± 2.5
HP123	1.23 +1.0 -0.36	86.7 ± 1	31.7 ± 1.2
HP114	1.14 ± 0.09	318.3 ± 1	3.0 ± 2.3
Ag213	2.13	18.75	21.1
Ag144	1.44	241.5	23.0
Ag150	1.50	294.5	-05.8
Ag134	1.34	280.9	48.3
Ag120	1.20	349	12.3

TABLE II. Positional coincidence (PC), i.e. the number of real matches within angular resolution, and simulated positional coincidence (SPC), from an isotropic distribution, between the highest energy CRs and CRQSOs for different threshold energies. 27 EeV - 1σ means, for instance, that the UHECR events considered have nominal energies such that, subtracting to it a 1σ energy error, the result is above 27 EeV. The last column indicates the Poisson probability of random occurrence of any number of coincidences bigger or equal than the real PC. Columns Ag, HP and FE stand for the number of considered events of AGASA, Haverah Park and Fly's Eye, respectively.

Energy cut-off	Ag	HP	FE	PC	SPC	Prob.
27 EeV - 1σ	58	-	-	12	8.7 ± 2.75	0.13
80 EeV - 1σ	5	4	1	4	2.7 ± 1.33	0.27
50 EeV - 2σ	4	4	1	4	2.6 ± 1.28	0.26
70 EeV - 2σ	1	3	1	3	2.0 ± 1.01	0.31

TABLE III. Same as Table I, but for gamma-ray blazars taken from the Third EGRET catalog.

Energy cut-off	Ag	HP	FE	PC	SPC	Prob.
27 EeV - 1σ	58	-	-	1	0.7 ± 0.88	0.46
80 EeV - 1σ	5	4	1	1	0.3 ± 0.59	0.26
50 EeV - 2σ	4	4	1	1	0.3 ± 0.52	0.26
70 EeV - 2σ	1	3	1	1	0.2 ± 0.47	0.19